

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

EMBEDDEDNESS OF RELEVANT INFORMATION
AND
ACCURACY OF INTERPERSONAL PREDICTION

BY



CAROL DIANNE GANAM

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN
PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

OCTOBER 23, 1968

THESIS
1968 (F)
76

ii.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Embeddedness of Relevant Information and Accuracy of Interpersonal Prediction", submitted by Carol Dianne Ganam in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the proposal that the degree of complexity of information input affects the accuracy with which interpersonal predictions are made.

Two variables were manipulated in a 3 x 3 factorial design. These were, (1) the amount of irrelevant information presented to the judge; and (2) the number of independent relevant information dimensions. It was proposed that both of these variables would increase the complexity of the information and thus increase the difficulty of the judge's task. It was hypothesized that an increase in either or both of these variables would lead to an increase in error in prediction. It was further expected that their effects would be additive.

225 Students served as judges -- 25 in each of the nine conditions entailed by the experimental design. Each judge made predictions on 24 interest test items for each of four targets -- 96 predictions in all. The dependent variables was the number of errors made.

The results of the analysis of the total data indicated that the effect of amount of irrelevant information on error was significant and in the expected direction. The effect of the number of independent relevant information dimensions was also significant, but in the opposite direction of that predicted. The interaction between the two variables was also significant.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Ganam1968>

Upon examination of the data in the context of the materials used it was suggested that the unexpected findings might be a result of a response set. This was particularly apparent in the conditions in which only one relevant information dimension was presented to the judges. A reanalysis of the data over all levels of irrelevant information but excluding the first level of number of information dimensions was done. In this reanalysis the effect of amount of irrelevant information was still significant but both the main effect of number of dimensions and the interaction were not. Although the response set interpretation was favored, other alternative interpretations of the anomalous results were mentioned. It was concluded that only further research could clearly differentiate between them.

Possible interpretations of the results of the present study in terms of information processing models were discussed and suggestions were made for the implementation of the methods used.

TO MY HUSBAND, SAL

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. W.A. Blanchard for his patience and continued assistance and guidance throughout this entire project.

I wish also to thank Dr. D. Larsen and Dr. B. Rule for serving on my committee. Their interest and constructive criticisms have added measurably to the quality of this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>ABSTRACT</u>	iii
Acknowledgments.....	v
List of Tables.....	viii
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
Assumed Similarity.....	4
Assumed Dissimilarity.....	4
Stereotyping.....	4
The Present Study.....	8
<u>METHODOLOGY</u>	11
Subjects.....	11
Experimental Design.....	11
Definitions of Variables.....	11
Information Relevance.....	11
Interest Area.....	13
Variable 1: Number of Information Domains.....	13
Variable 11: Embeddedness.....	14
Development of the Test.....	15
Selection of Targets.....	18
Ordering of Items.....	18
Problem of Assimilation-Contrast.....	19
Administration.....	20
Scoring.....	21
Summary.....	21

	<u>Page</u>
<u>RESULTS</u>	24
Main Effects.....	26
Interaction Effects.....	26
<u>DISCUSSION</u>	30
Suggestions for Modification of the Present Study.....	34
<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	38
<u>APPENDICES</u>	41
Appendix A.....	42
Appendix B.....	43

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE 1 - Summary of Design.....	22
TABLE 2 - Means and Standard Deviation of the Treatments.....	24
TABLE 3 - Partial Analysis of Variance for Significance.....	25
TABLE 4 - Complete Analysis of Variance Summary.....	25
TABLE 5 - Data used for Re-analysis: Two Levels of A.....	28
TABLE 6 - Complete Analysis of Variance Summary.....	28

INTRODUCTION

The area of interpersonal prediction as a major interest to psychologists is readily accounted for. Since much, if not all, of man's social behavior can be conceived as a function of how he perceives other people's behavior, how he interprets and how he makes use of knowledge about the other person, studying the dynamics of interpersonal prediction promises to be rewarding in our attempts to understand human behavior. It is evident too that many facets of interpersonal prediction exist and offer themselves for study. For clarity and brevity, the actual prediction task may be considered a three stage sequence as follows: Stage I may be thought of as the 'Information Input' stage. At this point the judge receives certain information about the other person. Stage II is the 'Information Processing' stage wherein the judge mentally completes some maneuvers relating to the information input; leading to Stage III which is the output or 'Prediction' itself.

A review of the relevant literature throughout the years of study of interpersonal prediction indicates that the bulk of the work has been focussed on these three main stages. It is obvious that these are only gross categorizations and that within each major focus there are several sub-categories. The following will briefly elaborate upon each of the major stages and illustrate some of the types of work which are being done within each focus.

Earliest work appears to be related to Stage III, the outcome or Prediction -- more specifically it was concerned

with the accuracy of the prediction made. Most of the early studies employed accuracy of prediction as a measure of judgmental ability. It followed that these studies attempted to identify the qualities which characterized the good judge of others (Adams, 1927; Vernon, 1933). Individuals, acting as judges, were given certain information about subjects (hereafter referred to as targets). They were requested to make use of this information to predict the responses of the targets to other questions or to evaluate their target on a rating scale. It was felt that the accuracy with which this task was accomplished denoted competence in interpersonal judgment. As it was a fairly simple task to measure accuracy, this was the major variable used at this early time in the study of the interpersonal prediction process. Implications generally included that a highly accurate score obtained in making the predictions also revealed something about the judge. It was suggested that a high accuracy score was indicative of the judge being an empathic individual or possessing some similar attribute (Dymond, 1949).

However, these initial attempts to explain the accuracy of interpersonal prediction by a description of the judge failed in that it was impossible to generalize the results of one study to another experimental condition. Studies indicated that accuracy could not be considered a general trait (Vernon, 1933 and Estes, 1938). Additional support for this conclusion was offered by Bender and Hastorf, 1950; 1953; Blanchard, 1959;

Crow and Hammond, 1957. Vernon found a very significant lack of agreement between different tests of judging personalities. His study led him to conclude that it was not possible to assume the existence of a general trait of "intuitive ability". On the same line of investigation, Estes found small support for generality. His targets were judged over several conditions. He found that his best judges were consistently better than his poor judges. Circularity of definition in this study however detracts from its value so that its results offered little that could lead to acceptance of an unequivocal conclusion of the presence of a general ability which characterized a good judge of others. Additional criticism of the use of accuracy of prediction as a measure of interpersonal predictive ability involved the general lack of inter-study consistency of results. Pertinent examples include studies investigating the relationship between level of intelligence and predictive accuracy. Many studies (Dymond, 1950; Kanner, 1931; Cogan, 1915: cited in Taft, 1955) found that there was a positive correlation between these variables, but Bender (1935) and Gage (1952) found no relationship whatever. Taft (1955) and Bruner and Taguiri (1954) show that attempts to relate predictive ability to other characteristics of the judge yield similarly ambiguous results.

In view of the difficulties indicated above, namely, (1) lack of generality of experimental results, and (2) inability to duplicate experimental findings, research drew away from the study of accuracy as the key to the understanding of interpersonal prediction and rather became directed at attempting to understand the

processes involved in the interpersonal prediction (Bruner and Taguiri, 1954). This brings us to the second major focus of study.

Cronbach (1955) was much concerned with Stage II, the processes underlying interpersonal predictions. He suggested that many processes could be involved in the accurate prediction task, and that these could perhaps partially explain the unsatisfactory results obtained by researchers using accuracy scores, as considered above. Some of the processes which he proposed are the following: Assumed similarity. Assumed similarity denotes the judgmental strategy whereby the judge makes his predictions in accordance with the assumed similarity between himself and the target.

If the judge were assuming similarity between himself and the target, without regard to the relevant variations in targets and domains of prediction, then his accuracy would vary directly with the real similarity between himself and the targets in the domain of prediction and not be related to the actual target situation.

Assumed dissimilarity. This is defined as the tendency of a judge to predict the responses of a target as being dissimilar to his own. The same problems occur where this effect operates as when 'assumed similarity' is in effect. Stereotyping. This is the tendency on the part of the judge to predict the mean group value for all or most individuals in the group.

These and others were proposed as constant processes

i.e. processes which disregard prediction-relevant variations in targets and domains of prediction. Although a valuable corrective to the earlier over simplified interpretation of accuracy scores, the fact that these processes were not insensitive to variations in information input needed to be clarified.

Berkowitz (1960) proposed that assumed similarity and assumed dissimilarity were subject to anchoring effects analogous to those occurring in psychophysical judgments (assimilation and contrast). In the case of social judgments the anchor is the judge's self concept. He suggested that with the judge's self concept acting as a standard stimulus, perceived similarity between the self and the standard stimulus (target) would have the effect of moving the target evaluation closer to the self than is actually the case. Perceived dissimilarity would result in evaluating the target as farther away from the self-concept than he actually is.

Blanchard (1963) demonstrated that variations in perceived similarity did significantly effect assumed similarity and assumed dissimilarity. In later studies (Blanchard 1965; 1966) he found that perceived similarity was a function of the information input.

Thoughts along the above lines suggest that while information processing in the prediction task may have definite influences on the resulting predictions, there is also need for more study on actual information input. This means if there are two sets of information and two prediction

tasks, the accuracy with which the predictions are made may well be a function of the processes involved in the task which in turn may be a function of the information presented. This then leads to a brief survey of the third major focus of study in the area of interpersonal prediction, which is Stage I as outlined previously.

Stage I, the information input, is of particular interest in this paper. Bruner and Taguiri (1957) in their excellent review on the "Perception of People" stated that one of the four major problems in the area of interpersonal prediction was concerned with "The nature of the constraining information provided the judges". Earlier, of course, many researchers had found that the more information known about the situation wherein an emotion was being expressed, the more accurate and reliable were judgements of the emotions (Jenness, 1932; Fernberger, 1928; cited in Taft, 1955).

Although major focus in work in interpersonal prediction has been on process and accuracy, interest in the influence of information characteristics has been growing in recent years.

Leventhal (1957) varied the amount of stimulus information available to the judge in making predictions. He found a more accurate prediction of the target was possible when more information was given to the judge about the target.

Pyron (1965) showed that information given to the judge does definitely influence his performance. He found accuracy of prediction was significantly greater where the judge

receives information about the target (as opposed to where he receives none at all). However, when the target is seen as completely inconsistent the judge relied upon his own position to predict the target. In this case, where information input could not be used to make predictions, the accuracy of the predictions was no better than when no information at all was presented to the judge.

Although these two studies demonstrated that information as such has an influence on prediction, the manipulations were gross and did not distinguish between amount of information as such, and the relevance of information. Blanchard (1965; 1966) was concerned specifically with the question of relevance of information input as a possible variable affecting the interpersonal prediction process. He conceptualized it as referring to the objectively determined predictive validity of the information upon which the judge is required to make his predictions. He found that prediction from items which were highly relevant to the predictions was highly accurate, but where the information given was irrelevant, judges predicted at a chance level. This work thus implied that relevance of information provided to the judge must be considered to be a contributing factor in determining the prediction process.

These studies indicate that the characteristics of the information input are effective determinants of the predictive outcomes. However, it must be recognized that

the data to date is rather limited. Although several authors have presented rather detailed conceptual arguments for the importance of information characteristics as determinants of the judgement process (Bieri, et al, 1966; Schroeder, et al, 1967), the number of studies specifically relevant to person judgement is limited.

The Present Study

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the effect of the complexity of the information input upon the accuracy of interpersonal judgements. Complexity is open to several definitions but among the most significant are: (1) multiplicity of information dimensions independently relevant to multiple domains of predictive items; (2) embeddedness of relevant information in a context of irrelevant information; (3) multiple information dimensions which in some combinative manner provide valid prediction (combinatorial rules may vary from simple to complex). Although all three variables are of interest, methods are immediately available for dealing only with the first two. Therefore, in the present study it was proposed to vary both the number of independently relevant information dimensions and the embeddedness of the relevant information in irrelevant information.

To this author's knowledge there is no research in the area of person prediction that is directly relevant to this problem. The most directly relevant data comes from the area of concept formation. Archer, et al (1955) investigated the effect of embedding of information relevant

to the identification of concepts in information which was similar but irrelevant. Dimensions of the stimuli were defined as relevant if they were necessary for the correct classification of the visual patterns. Irrelevant dimensions were those that were not necessary to identify the patterns. They found that both the time required and the number of errors in identification increased with an increase in the amount of irrelevant information.

Walker and Bourne (1961) varied both the amount of relevant and the amount of irrelevant information in a concept identification task. As in the earlier study mentioned above they found that the number of errors increased with the increase in the amount of irrelevant information. They also found that error rate also increased with the increase in the number of relevant but independent information dimensions. This latter finding was explained in terms of the correlative increase in the number of possible categories for placement of the stimuli. As the number of non-redundant relevant information dimensions increased the number of possible categories increased thus increasing the complexity of the task.

Partially contradictory evidence was reported by Byers and Davidson (1968). They found that an increase in complexity due to an increase in the amount of irrelevant information did not significantly effect concept identification (although there was a decremental effect). Increases in

the amount of non-redundant relevant information did lead to a significant increase in error.

If we assume that categorization is part of the complex process mediating interpersonal predictions the above data on the effects of information complexity upon accuracy and error in concept identification (categorization) has analogous relevance for person prediction.

The specific purposes of the present study were to investigate the effects of both the increase in the amount of irrelevant information and the increase in the number of relevant information domains on the accuracy of interpersonal prediction. Following Walker, and Bourne (1961) the specific expectations were:

- 1) that as the amount of irrelevant information is increased errors in prediction will increase.

- 2) that as the number of relevant information items increased error in prediction will also increase.

It was expected that these effects will be additive.

METHODOLOGY

A single test was administered to the subjects in this study. This was an interpersonal prediction measure in which the subject's task was to predict how specified targets (others) would respond to given interest test items. The accuracy of these predictions provided the basic data for evaluating the hypothesis specified in Chapter 1.

Subjects

The subjects were 225 students from introductory psychology classes at the University of Alberta. These students volunteered to participate in this particular study to fulfill course requirements.

Experimental Design

A 3 X 3 factorial design was used. The variables were: (1) number of information domains considered; and (2) embeddedness of relevant information (embeddedness). Each of these variables was manipulated over 3 levels. These levels will be more precisely defined following further explication of the operational definitions of the variables.

Definitions of Variables

Basic to the understanding of the definitions of the two variables involved in this study are two concepts--those of Information Relevance and Interest Area.

Information Relevance. This term was introduced by Blanchard (1966). Conceptually it refers to "...the objectively determined predictive validity of the information which a judge is given about a target with regard to the predictions he is

asked to make." (p. 379). Operationally it is essentially concerned with the correlation between information input and predictions required.

The procedure by which Blanchard determined the relevance of the information involved the use of a 300 item interest test. The items on the test were drawn from various sources, but mainly from the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. The items were selected to represent five interest scales--aesthetic, science, social service, political and business--with approximately 60 items representing each area. Five abbreviated interest scales were developed from these. These abbreviated scales consisted of ten items, from the sub-set of sixty, which appeared to best represent the respective interest areas.

A measure of the predictive validity of each scale for each of the 300 items in the test was then obtained. The interest test was administered to one hundred students serving as a criterion group. All protocols were scored on the five interest area scales. (A LIKE response was scored as 1 and a DISLIKE response was scored as 0). Each of the one hundred subjects then, had five interest area scores: each score ranging from 0 to 10. The responses of the subject to each of the three hundred items were correlated with each of his five interest area scores. These correlations then yielded a measure of the predictive validity of each interest area scale for each item on the test. This predictive validity is termed the information relevance of the interest area scale for the item.

Using the target's responses to the ten item interest area scale as information provided a convenient method for the control of information relevance. By selecting prediction items with known correlation to the interest area scale presented, it was possible to control information relevance. A scale was operationally defined to be of high relevance to an item if it correlated $\pm .40$ or greater with it. (High relevance will hereafter be abbreviated to HIR.) A scale was operationally defined as being of low relevance if it correlated $\pm .10$ or less with the item. (Hereafter low information relevance will be abbreviated to LIR.)¹

Interest Area. The meaning of Interest Area has been indirectly introduced above. More specifically what we mean here is an interest domain or factor. In terms of the test materials used in the present study an interest area was concretely determined by

- (a) one of the interest area scales and
- (b) the remaining items in Blanchard's 300 item test which correlate $\pm .40$ with that scale (HIR items).

Variable I: Number of Information Domains. The number of Information Domains included in the Prediction Test varied over three levels, with either one, two or three Interest Areas included. In terms of the actual mechanics of the test

1. In the present study the LIR criterion used was a correlation of $\pm .20$ or less. This less stringent requirement was found necessary to obtain the required number of items.

booklets an interest area included a five item interest area scale presented as information to the judge and either eight, twelve or twenty four HIR prediction items for that scale. The number of prediction items for each interest area varied depending on the number of interest areas involved. This variation will be more fully described below.

It should be noted that information for each interest area was presented for only five items rather than for the ten as in Blanchard's original procedure. This was necessary in order to keep the total number of information items in the more complex conditions within reasonable limits. The five items used in each case were selected from the original ten in the following manner:

First, all items in the selected scale for which the target had not responded in the actuarial direction were eliminated. Secondly, Fisher's z score transformations were made for each of the remaining items and the five items whose average correlations with each other were highest, were selected for use.

Variable II: Embeddedness. Embeddedness was defined as the number of LIR items (irrelevant information items) presented as information to the judge along with the relevant information he was given. This was varied over three levels with either no LIR items, 10 LIR items or 20 LIR items included in the information input.

Development of the Test

Prediction test booklets were prepared for each condition specified in the design. In general, the test booklet consisted of two pages of general instructions and four prediction sections. Each prediction section represented one of four targets and consisted of two parts: (1) Information. In this part the judge was given the information about the target upon which he was to base his predictions. This consisted of the items representing the abbreviated interest area scales and the LIR items. The targets' responses to these items were indicated by a red circled letter -- L for LIKE and D for DISLIKE. The information sections varied from condition to condition in both content and number of items. This variation will be more fully described below. (2) The items to be predicted, numbered from 1 to 24. These items were presented on the page facing the information section for each target. The judge made his prediction, by circling either the L or the D provided for each item. The prediction items varied from condition to condition only in content, not in number. (See appendix B for a sample test.)

There were nine different conditions.

Condition I. This condition made use of only one interest area. Here the judge was given the targets' responses to one, five item interest area scale. He was then to respond to the 24 items which correlated with these $\pm .40$ or greater. These were the prediction items.

The procedure for the selection of these items was again based upon Blanchard's early data (1966). He found approximately 30 items for each interest area scale which were HIR for that scale. Those items which the target responded to in a manner opposite to the actuarial response were deleted from the set of possible prediction items if this could be accomplished while leaving a remainder of 24 items. Where more than 24 items were left, the numbers six and four were obtained by entering a table of random numbers. The first item selected of the 24 or more was the first which came on or after number six, the fourth item after this one, became the second prediction item, the fourth after this became the third prediction item, etc.

In Condition I, the 24 items were related to only one interest area, as only one information scale of five items was presented to the judge.

Condition II. This condition made use of two interest areas. Here the judge was given the targets' responses to two sets of interest area scales. As there were five information items for each interest area, and there were two interest areas, the judge was informed of the targets' responses to a total of ten items. The prediction items for this condition consisted of twelve HIR items for each of the interest areas yielding the total of 24 -- constant throughout the test. Twelve of the items from the original

twenty four prediction items (related to the first interest area scale, as in Condition I) were used in conditions presenting two interest areas. The second set of twelve prediction items, HIR for the second interest area scale were selected by the procedure above to complete the twenty four prediction item set.

Condition III. This condition made use of three interest areas. Here, the judge was presented with the targets' responses to 3 sets of interest area scales. As there were five items for each interest area, and there were 3 interest areas, the judge was informed of the targets' responses to a total of fifteen relevant information items. The prediction items for this condition consisted of eight items for each interest area. These were HIR to that interest area. In cases where the judge received information from 3 interest area scales, the prediction items thus consisted of 2 sets of eight items drawn from the two sets of 12 used in Condition II. The third set of 8 was selected from those items HIR to the additional interest area scale yielding a total of 24 prediction items.

Conditions IV, V and VI. These conditions were the same as Conditions I, II and III respectively differing only in that ten information items which were irrelevant or of low relevance (LIR) for the prediction task were added to the information in each condition to serve the function of embedding.

Conditions VII, VIII and IX. These conditions were the same as Conditions I, II and III differing only in that twenty information items which were of low relevance (LIR) to the prediction items were added to the information in each condition to serve the function of embedding.

Selection of Targets

Targets were selected from Blanchard's (1966) criterion group referred to earlier -- (see page 12, methodology). Targets A and B were selected if they had scored high (eight or more of the ten items) on two of the abbreviated interest area scales, and low (two or less of the ten items) on a third interest area scale. Targets C and D were selected to mirror image Targets A and B. Target C scored low on the two scales Target A had scored high on and high on the scale where A had scored low. Target D had scored high where B had scored low and low where B scored high.

Ordering of Items

All of the items which were to be used for each information page were listed initially as they were found in the original source booklet. (See appendix A). A table of random numbers was entered and the numbers 3 and 7 were obtained. Thus, the third item became the first and the tenth item became the second, ($3 + 7 = 10$), the seventeenth item became the third until all of the items for that information page had been included. They appeared in the test booklet in the order obtained by this method. The prediction items were placed in the order in which

they were found in the original booklet (see appendix A) containing the complete 300 items.

Problem of Assimilation-Contrast

Since it was not feasible to attempt to obtain 25 subjects who scored in a manner which would enable their being matched to a suitable target prior to obtaining the data for this study, three precautions were taken in order to control for the assimilation-contrast effect. These were:

- i. random assignment of subject judges to a particular set of targets assuming thus that the two effects would cancel each other.
- ii. relatively large N (25) was used in each cell for the same purpose.
- iii. targets were selected so that Target A was a mirror image of Target C and Target B was a mirror image of Target D, i.e. one member of each pair had responded completely oppositely to the other.

As each subject received information about each of the four targets it was hoped that the effects of the assimilation-contrast process would balance each other, rather than inflate the score in one direction.

Administration

Testing sessions were arranged during the weekdays usually late in the afternoon. To maintain maximum constancy regarding the physical context of the testing situations, the rooms used were similar, all in the same building, with a thirty subject capacity.

The tests were administered to groups. Facilities were available for simultaneous testing of thirty students, but the actual size of the groups varied from three to twenty-seven. All tests were constructed to fulfill the requirements of the design as listed earlier.

In the introduction to the experiment, subjects were informed that this was a study in the area of interpersonal prediction; that it asked the question "How well can you predict a person's behavior if you know something about that person?" They were told that this was of particular interest to social psychologists as all of our social behavior is a function of how well we can predict other people's behavior. The subjects were then told that their task in the experiment would be to make these kinds of interpersonal predictions. The subjects were instructed to carefully read the general directions. They were told that the experimenter would go over the instructions orally when they had finished reading them. This was done

and subjects were instructed to indicate their responses by circling either a letter L for LIKE or D for DISLIKE -- indicating how they felt the target would respond to the activity, amusement, occupation or school subject given. They were instructed to base their decisions upon the information they were given about the target's choice to other items. Questions were invited and when all subjects seemed satisfied that they understood their task, they were instructed to begin. The time required to complete the booklet varied from twenty to thirty minutes. (Complete instructions can be seen in Appendix B).

Scoring

Predictive accuracy was defined as the number of correct responses the judge made. Generally this was determined by the congruence of the targets' responses and the judges' predictions. Where it was impossible to select a sufficient number of prediction items where the target had responded in the actuarial direction, actuarial responses were taken as being correct. Judges responded by circling an L for LIKE and a D for DISLIKE. The judge's score was the number he answered correctly out of the twenty four for each target. This was hand scored and all scores were verified.

Summary

The judges were required to predict the 'LIKE' or 'DISLIKE' responses of four targets to four sets of prediction items -- one set for each target.

Each judge made ninety-six predictions. The only information available to the judge about the target consisted of the targets' responses to interest items. For each prediction item, there were five relevant information items. In some conditions either ten or twenty irrelevant information items were used to embed the relevant information. Table 1 provides a summary of the experimental design.

Table 1
Summary of Design

		NUMBER OF INTEREST AREAS		
B		I	II	III
Number of LIR items (noise)	0	5/24*	10/24	15/24
	10	15/24	20/24	25/24
	20	25/24	30/24	35/24

* The number above the slash in each cell indicates the number of information items given to each judge in that condition. The number under the slash in each cell indicates the number of predictions by each judge under that condition, for each target.

Hypotheses. Translating the hypotheses introduced in Chapter 1, into more specific terms of the expectations for the data, they were:

Hypothesis 1. The accuracy of prediction will decrease significantly as the number of interest areas presented increases.

Hypothesis 11. The accuracy of prediction will decrease significantly as the number of LIR items increase (degree of embeddedness increases).

RESULTS

The basic data in this study consists of the number of errors made by two hundred twenty five² judges making inter-personal predictions in nine different conditions -- twenty five judges in each treatment cell. Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of the errors made by the judges in each of these categories.

TABLE 2
THE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE TREATMENTS

		NUMBER OF SCALES					
		A ₁		A ₂		A ₃	
DEGREE OF EMBEDDEDNESS	B ₁	X	21.30	X	1.84	X	3.24
		SD	2.60	SD	.30	SD	.62
	B ₂	X	16.20	X	6.80	X	4.96
		SD	1.38	SD	.75	SD	2.00
	B ₃	X	17.40	X	9.08	X	8.32
		SD	1.53	SD	3.00	SD	1.30

2. Two hundred and twenty seven judges actually participated in the study. The responses from two of the judges, however, were not used as these two persons had completed their predictions for only three of the required four targets, probably having turned two pages rather than one during their performance.

In order to determine whether the treatment means actually did differ significantly before total analysis of variance was completed, partial analysis was done yielding the results presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3
PARTIAL ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SIGNIFICANCE

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	P<
Treatments (between)	9299.56	8	1163.195	26.43	.01
Within Treatments	9505.20	216	44.01		
Total	18804.76				

It is apparent that the treatment means do differ significantly. The complete analysis of variance is presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4
COMPLETE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	P<
A: NUMBER OF DOMAINS	7927.20	2	3963.6	90.06	.01
B. DEGREE OF EMBEDDEDNESS	334.76	2	167.38	4.01	.05
A X B: INTERACTION	1037.60	4	259.40	5.98	.01
ERROR: (WITHIN FROM TABLE 2)	9505.20	216	44.01		

MAIN EFFECTS

The A main effect (Number of Domains) was significant. Although significant, the trend of the mean differences was in the opposite direction to that predicted. As can be seen in Table 2 the largest error scores were obtained in conditions where only one information domain was presented. This is not consistent with hypotheses introduced in previous chapters and does not support theoretical expectations.

The B main effect (Embeddedness) is significant and in the expected direction, i.e. as the degree of embeddedness increases, accuracy of prediction decreases. This is consistent with hypotheses introduced in previous chapters and supports the main thesis of the paper.

INTERACTION EFFECT

The A X B interaction effect is significant. This is in contradiction to expectation. It was expected that the effects of these two variables would be additive rather than interactive. Results appear to indicate that the effect of embedding relevant information differs significantly for the different numbers of interest areas.

In an attempt to explain this lack of conformity to expectations, the original means were re-examined. It is apparent that conditions under A_1 -- one interest area -- yield results which are not in accordance with those obtained under the other two conditions -- two and three interest areas. It was felt that this might be due in part to the particular fact that the prediction items for this set of conditions required identical responses be made to each item in order for the judge to make

the correct response. That is, for the judge to obtain a perfect score, he was required to respond to all twenty four items in the same direction. Since all of the judges are presently University students, who in all probability are exposed to examination and other situations wherein they are required to make a series of dichotomous choices, they have probably established a certain set towards these kinds of situations. It is very likely that their past experience makes them somewhat reluctant to respond to all the items in the same direction. They have established a 'set' through their exposure to other similar situations, e.g. true, false sets of questions, to respond generally to both the dichotomous choices at different times. In this case, the set would be to respond at times LIKE and at other times DISLIKE. There appears subjectively to be a very definite reluctance to responding to only one of these response choices throughout the entire set of conditions.

In view of the above rationale it was felt that the significant A main effect in the direction opposite to that predicted and a significant interaction effect was in this case possibly a function of the judge's 'set' to respond to both of the dichotomous choices rather than a function of alternate information processes operating or the variables operating differently under different conditions. To determine the possible validity of this assumption and to determine whether the significant and unexpected interaction were due to the

judge's 'set' to respond as suggested above, a re-analysis of the data was completed. This was done using the results obtained under levels two and three of the A variable, (deleting level A_1 , as this condition required that the judge respond to all items in the same direction to be accurate) and all levels of B as indicated by Table 5 as follows:

TABLE 5
DATA USED FOR RE-ANALYSIS TWO LEVELS OF A

DEGREE OF EMBEDDEDNESS	NUMBER OF SCALES			
			2 Interest Areas	3 Interest Areas
			A ₂	A ₃
0 LIR	B ₁		1.84	3.24
10 LIR	B ₂		6.80	4.96
20 LIR	B ₃		9.08	8.32

The numbers in the cells represent the mean numbers of errors made by the judges in that condition. A summary of the Analysis of Variance of this data is shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6
COMPLETE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - SUMMARY

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQ.	F	P
A: NUMBER OF DOMAINS	6	1	6.0	.30	N.S
B. DEGREE OF EMBEDDEDNESS	950.9	2	475.4	23.90	.01
A X B: INTERACTION	68.0	2	34.0	1.07	N.S.
ERROR: (WITHIN FROM TABLE 5)	2859.2	144	19.9		

Neither the main effect of number of prediction domains nor the interaction are significant in this analysis. This still does not confirm the first hypothesis of this study but is not as strongly contradictory. The comparison of the results of the two analyses is consistent with the response set interpretation speculatively put forward.

DISCUSSION

The analysis of the data presented in the last section gives clear indication of support for the first hypothesis proposed, but equally clearly does not support the second hypothesis. The retrograde effect of irrelevant information on predictive accuracy is distinctly indicated in both analyses. As the degree of embeddedness of relevant information in irrelevant information increases, the accuracy of prediction decreases. These findings are generally consistent with Schroeder, Driver and Struefert's (1965) suggestion that an increase in the amount of the information input is equivalent to an increase in the complexity of information. Although their primary concern was with the complexity of the cognitive processes as a dependent variable, it would seem reasonable to assume that increasing demands for complex processing of incoming data would also increase the probability of error. It should be recognized however, that these data say little with respect to their central hypothesis regarding an inverted U shaped relationship between complexity of information input and complexity of processing. There is no hint of other than a linear relationship between complexity of input and error rate in our data. This in no way, however, denies such a possibility since our data cover a restricted range of the postulated dimension of complexity.

These findings are also consistent with Information Theory. The relevant Information Theory concept is that of 'overloading the information circuit'. The fact that accuracy decreases from level B_1 to B_2 to B_3 (from 0 LIR

to 10 LIR to 20 LIR), can be interpreted as an increase in the information load, or overload, which functions to deteriorate performance. (Accuracy falls off slowly as overload increases.) Information transmission increases at first, then decreases with the complexity or load or number of 'bits', (Schroeder, Driver and Struefert, 1965, page 96). The amount of information which the judge must process definitely increases over the three levels of conditions of B.

Past findings more directly relevant to the results of the present study are those of Bourne and his coworkers (1961; Byers and Davidson, 1968; Archer et al, 1955). They found, as was mentioned in Chapter 1, that increasing irrelevant information in concept identification tasks had a detrimental effect on the subject's success. If we assume, as we suggested earlier, that the process of categorization served as a mediator in both tasks, the analogical similarity between concept identification task and that of interpersonal judgement is clear.

The results of the analysis relevant to the second hypothesis are not so clear. In both analyses the results did not conform to expectation. In the first analysis with the complete data the effect of the number of domains on error was significant but an examination of the cell means clearly indicates that the differences were in a direction opposite to that expected. An uncritical interpretation of this result would be that increasing the number of information

domains increases rather than decreases accuracy. This interpretation can be made consistent with Schroeder, Driver and Struefert's proposals and with Information Theory by assuming that our operational entry into this aspect of the real world of information was at a fairly simple level. If the inverted U function between information complexity and information transmission and/or use holds as Schroeder, et al suggest and the data of Muller (1955); Sumby et al (1958); and McGill (1957) suggest, then we might assume that our operational entry had been at a point below the optimum level of complexity. Thus an increase in complexity would bring the level closer to that optimum and result in an improved performance.

Although such an interpretation is possible the alternative interpretation suggested in the last chapter seems to us to be a more reasonable one. The sizeable difference between the mean error under conditions of one interest domain and those of two and three interest domains, although not impossible under the curvilinear formulation, is surprisingly greater than one would ordinarily expect. The size of the anomalous break between conditions of one and two interest domains makes us suspect that other factors are operating. We have suggested that this other factor is that of a response set; the natural set that students develop to vary their choice of alternatives on multiple response choice tests. Such an interpretation would seem more

consistent with the size of the differences obtained.

Either of these interpretations would also explain the significant and unexpected interaction between amount of irrelevant information and number of interest domains. Of course, it should be clearly recognized that all such interpretive suggestions are purely speculative and ad hoc in nature. Only further research will enable us to confidently differentiate between them.

The response set interpretation cannot, however, reasonably account for the failure to find significant differences in error between conditions of two and three interest domains. The accuracy of predictions did not decrease significantly as the number of interest areas increased. (See Table 5) This finding is not consistent with our expectations. The only alternative to the acceptance of the null hypothesis that we can suggest is that while the demandingness of the task of sorting relevant from irrelevant items does increase from conditions under A_2 to conditions under A_3 , the increase is not significant. In terms of Schroeder, Driver and Struefert's curvilinear hypothesis, perhaps the change from conditions with two interest areas to conditions with three interest areas in this particular instance is not significantly different enough to show a change in predictive effectiveness leading to no significant change in the accuracy of prediction under the two conditions. In other words, it may simply be that the gradient of change may be too small from one

condition to another in order for an effect to be noticed. Again this is an ad hoc proposal that can only clearly be demonstrated by further research.

In summary then, the data of the present study clearly supports the expectation that increasing amounts of irrelevant information introduced into the interpersonal judgment task increases the difficulty of that task as indicated by the increase in error. These data also provide some indirect support for the suggested analogy between the processes involved in interpersonal judgment and those involved in the more standard laboratory concept identification task. Support for such an analogy would suggest that we might expect to find additional functional similarities between the two tasks.

The data equally clearly do not support the second expectation that an increase in the number of prediction domains also increases complexity and thus difficulty of the task. The question of whether the null hypothesis should be accepted on the basis of this data is a moot point, but we would strongly suggest that the data in this study (in any single study for that matter) are insufficient for such a judgment.

Suggestions for Modification of the Present Study.

It has been made clear that the basic tool for study in the area of interpersonal predictions using techniques similar to the one employed here, must be developed to meet the needs of the situation more adequately. A list

of the possible changes which are required follows.

1. The number of available prediction items in each interest area is presently too small. Where at least twenty four prediction items relevant to the information items are required, a tool should be developed which would make it possible to select these readily. It should be possible to have more items more highly relevant to the information scale than is provided by the present set of data.

2. The number of items which are LIR to the information scale should be increased. A tool which would offer a larger number of such items and provide for a lower correlation of them to the information items, is required.

3. The number of available items which are LIR to one, two or more areas should be increased. In this study it was found that the items which were LIR to all three areas in conditions under A_3 were obtained almost totally from one other interest area. It is entirely possible that this may have some effect which we have not isolated on the prediction process. It would be far more suitable to have a larger pool of items from which to draw LIR items which are LIR to several areas and also have these items LIR to each other.

4. It seems necessary to develop a tool which will provide prediction items for which the actuarial responses include both those in a negative and those in a positive direction. By this method, it would be possible to rule

out the possibility of a judge's 'set' to respond in a certain manner influencing his actual performance on the basis of the material presented to him.

5. The number of items which make up the abbreviated information scale should also be increased, but the high correlations of these items to the actual areas, will be maintained. By this method, it would be possible to ensure that all targets selected responded in the actuarial direction to all of the items used in later study.

In sum, what is being suggested is that what researchers in this area need is a large pool of diversified items within which the relevant actuarial relationships have been well established. Given such a pool, the operational translation of theoretical hypotheses into actual materials and the manipulation of such operationally defined variables would be a relatively easy matter.

Assuming that such a pool of items were available a number of lines of potentially fruitful investigation would open up.

One line of investigation that immediately suggests itself would be the study of the hypothesized inverted U relationship between complexity of information input and adequacy of judgment. By using a greater range of values of both of the variables employed in the present study, it should be possible to gather evidence that is effectively relevant to this hypothesis. This is not possible with the

limited set of items now available.

A second line of investigation would be to attempt to empirically extend the analogy between the functional relationships between information and performance established in concept identification and presumably similar relationships in person prediction. For example, Bourne and Haygood (1959) found that redundancy of relevant information had little effect on the effectiveness of concept identification when no irrelevant information was presented but that with increasing levels of irrelevant information redundancy of relevant information led to improved performance. It would seem a simple step to replicate that study within the context of the paradigm of the present study and to thus check this plausible functional similarity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, H.F. The good judge of personality. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1927, 22, 72-78
- Archer, E.J., Bourne, L.E., Jr., and Brown, F.G. Concept identification as a function of irrelevant information and instructions. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1955, 49, 153-164.
- Bender, I.E. A study in integrations of personalities by prediction and matching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Syracuse, 1935.
- Bender, I.E., and Hastorf, A.H. On measuring generalized empathic ability (social sensitivity). Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 503-506.
- Berkowitz, L. The judgmental process in personality functioning. Psychological Review, 1960, 67, 130-142.
- Bieri, J., Atkins, A.L., Briar, S., Leaman, R.L., Miller, H., Tripodi, T. Clinical and social judgment: discrimination of behavioral information. John Wiley and Sons Inc. New York, copyright, 1966.
- Blanchard, W.A. Cognitive complexity and the accuracy of stereotyping. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Oregon, 1959.
- Blanchard, W.A. Assimilation, contrast and cognitive complexity in interpersonal prediction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1963.
- Blanchard, W.A. Real similarity, perceived similarity and information relevance in interpersonal prediction. CPA paper, 1965.
- Blanchard, W.A. Relevance of information and accuracy of interpersonal prediction: A methodological note. Psychological Reports, 1966, 18, 379-383.
- Bruner, J.S., and Taguiri, R. The perception of people. In G. Lindzey (ed.). Handbook of Social Psychology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Bruner, J.S., and Taguiri, R. Going beyond the information given. In Bruner et al (eds.). Contemporary Approaches to Cognition. Cambridge, Howard University Press, 1957, 41-69.
- Byers, J.L., and Davidson, R.L. Relevant and irrelevant information in concept attainment. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1968, 76, (2. Pt. 1) 283-287.

- Cronbach, L.J. Processes affecting scores on "understanding of others" and "assumed similarity". Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 177-193.
- Cogan, L.G., Conklin, R.M., and Hollingsworth, H.L. An experimental study of self analysis, estimates of associates and the results of tests. Sch. E. Soc., 1915, 2, 171-173.
- Crow, W.J., and Hammond, K.R. The generality of accuracy and response sets in interpersonal perceptions. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 54, 172-178.
- Dymond, R.F. A scale for the measurement of empathic ability. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 127-133.
- Dymond, R.F. Personality and empathy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1950, 14, 343-350.
- Estes, S.G. Judging personality from expressive behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1938, 33, 217-236.
- Fernberger, S.W. False suggestion and the Piderit model. American Journal of Psychology, 1928, 40, 562-568.
- Gage, N.L. Judging interests from expressive behavior. Psychological Monographs, 1952, 66, No.18 (whole No.350).
- Jenness, A. The recognition of facial expression of emotions. Psychological Bulletin, 1932, 29, 324-350.
- Kanner, L. Judging emotions from facial expressions. Psychological Monographs, 1931, 41, No 3 (whole No. 1986).
- Levanthal, H. Cognitive processes and interpersonal prediction. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 176-180.
- McGill, W.J. Serial effects in auditory threshold judgments, Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1957, 53, (5), 297-303.
- Muller, P.F., Sidowsky, R.C., Slivinsky, A.J., Alluisi, E.A. and Fitts, P.M. The symbolic coding of information in cathode ray tubes and similar displays. U.S. Air Force Technical Report, No. 35-375.
- Pyron, B. Accuracy of interpersonal prediction as a function of consistency of information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, Feb., 67, 190-196.
- Schroeder, H.M., Driver, M.J., and Streufert, S. Human information processing, individuals and groups function in complex social situations. 1967, New York, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.

- Sumby, W.H., Chambliss, D. and Pollack, I., Information transmission with elementary auditory displays. Journal of Acoustical Society of America, 1958, 30, 425-429.
- Taft, R. The ability to judge people. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 1-23.
- Vernon, P.E. Some characteristics of the good judge of personality. Journal of Social Psychology, 1933, 4, 42-58.
- Walker, C.S., and Bourne, L.E., Jr. The identification of concepts as a function of amounts of relevant and irrelevant information. American Journal of Psychology, 1961, 74, 410-417.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF SOURCE BOOKLET

FOR TEST ITEMS

TEST BOOKLET

This test is designed to measure your interest in certain occupations and activities. It is an interest test, not a test of intelligence or aptitude.

The information collected here will be used for research purposes only. Your responses will be held in strictest confidence, of course.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

In order that your test may be scored accurately, it is important for you to follow the directions carefully:

- 1) Use only the special pencil for the test.
- 2) Do not write on the test booklet. All responses should be made on the answer sheet.
- 3) Fill in your name, age, and sex in the blanks at the side of the answer sheet.
- 4) Answer spaces, made by dotted lines on the answer sheet, are numbered to correspond to the numbering of the items in the test. You are to decide how you wish to mark a question, then blacken the answer space that corresponds to this answer.

EXAMPLE: Do you like or dislike children? If you like children you would fill in the answer sheet like this;



If you dislike children of course, you would blacken the space under D.

- 5) Make a solid black mark. If you make a mistake erase the black mark completely. These tests will be machine scored. Any pencil marks on the paper will close an electrical circuit, causing the machine to record a score.
- 6) It is important that you answer ALL the items. After you have completed the test, go over your answer sheet and make sure that you have completed ALL of the items.

PART I OCCUPATIONS

Indicate for each occupation listed below whether you would like that kind of work or not. Disregard considerations of salary, social standing, future advancement, etc. Consider only whether or not you would like to do what is involved in the occupation. You are not asked if you would take up the occupation permanently, but merely whether or not you would enjoy that kind of work, regardless of any necessary skills, abilities or training which you may or may not possess. Make all answers on the answer sheet.

Work rapidly. Your first impressions are desired here. Answer ALL the items. Many of the seemingly trivial and irrelevant items are very useful in diagnosing your real attitude.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Actor (Actress) | 31. Min'.of Foreign Affairs |
| 2. Advertizer | 32. Minister of Health, |
| 3. Advertising Illustrator | Welfare and Education |
| 4. Architect | 33. Musician |
| 5. Artist | 34. Office Manager |
| | 35. Playground Director |
| 6. Astronomer | |
| 7. Athletic Director | 36. Poet |
| 8. Author of a novel | 37. Politician |
| 9. Bacteriologist | 38. Premier of Alberta |
| 10. Biologist | 39. President of Local |
| | Retailers Assoc'n |
| 11. Chemist | 40. Probation Officer |
| 12. Clinical Psychologist | 41. Psychiatrist |
| 13. College Professor | 42. Purchasing Agent |
| 14. Consul | 43. Retailer |
| 15. Corporation Lawyer | 44. Sales Manager |
| | 45. Scientific Illustrator |
| 16. Dramatist | |
| 17. Editor | 46. Scientific Researchwrkr. |
| 18. Employment manager | 47. Sec'y Chamber of Commerce |
| 19. Florist | 48. Social Worker |
| 20. Gov't Labor Dispute Mediator | 49. Stock Broker |
| | 50. Vocational Counselor |
| 21. Grade School Teacher | |
| 22. High School Teacher | 51. Wholesaler |
| 23. Hotel Manager | |
| 24. Importer | |
| 25. Inventor | |
| | |
| 26. Judge | |
| 27. Lawyer, Corporation | |
| 28. Lawyer, Criminal | |
| 29. Manufacturer | |
| 30. Mayor of a large city | |

PART II. SCHOOL SUBJECTS

Indicate as in Part I your interests in the following possible courses in school.

- 52. Algebra
- 53. Arithmetic
- 54. Art
- 55. Botany
- 56. Calculus

- 57. Civics
- 58. Cost accounting
- 59. Cultural Anthropology
- 60. Dramatics
- 61. Economics

- 62. English Composition
- 63. Ethics (i.e. study of moral systems)
- 64. Experimental Psychology
- 65. Geography
- 66. Geology

- 67. Geometry
- 68. History
- 69. Literature
- 70. Mathematics
- 71. Modern Business Methods

- 72. Music
- 73. Parliamentary Procedure
- 74. Philosophy
- 75. Philosophy of Government
- 76. Physics

- 77. Physiology
- 78. Political Science
- 79. Public Administration
- 80. Public Speaking
- 81. Sales Methods

- 82. Sociology
- 83. Statistics
- 84. Zoology

PART III. ACTIVITIES

Indicate your interest as in Part 1.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 85. Design furniture | 102. Listen to the case history of a person who needs help |
| 86. Do an experiment with the muscle and nerve of a frog | 103. Prepare advertising for new houses to be offered for sale |
| 87. Serve as president of a board of directors | 104. Understand theoretical ideas like Einstein's theory |
| 88. Be a member of a Canadian "Peace Corps" | 105. Write laboratory reports |
| 89. Help out during a school or convention registration | 106. Become an expert at appraising the value of homes, furnishings or cars |
| 90. Make recommendations to a court in the interest of juvenile or adult law-breakers | 107. Go from door to door persuading people to vote a certain way |
| 91. Calculate the depreciation of equipment for a transportation firm | 108. Plan a complicated investment program to insure a healthy profit |
| 92. Plan the interior decorations of a home | 109. Evaluate the emotional appeal of a particular opera |
| 93. Work in a stock exchange | 110. Plan a marketing campaign for a new line of synthetic garments |
| 94. Mould a statue in clay | 111. Read books on investment |
| 95. Act as a consultant to the Bank of Canada | 112. Aid in the rehabilitation of the ex-convict |
| 96. Take a welfare child into your own home as your own | 113. Help underprivileged boys and girls in a poor neighborhood |
| 97. Read scientific journals | 114. Buy and sell antiques for profit |
| 98. Study facts in order to arrive at a new conclusion | 115. Read financial pages |
| 99. Attend a symphony concert | |
| 100. Apply methods to new fields | |
| 101. Watch a new play | |

- | | |
|---|---|
| 116. Help a child overcome a physical handicap | 135. Argue with a communist |
| 117. Pass out campaign leaflets | 136. Attend a style show |
| 118. Read "National Geographic" magazine | 137. Watch a football game with friends |
| 119. Read about the development of scientific ideas | 138. Buy goods for a department store |
| 120. Buy goods for a department store | 139. Select a landscape to be painted or photographed |
| 121. Play golf | 140. Work with ideas rather than people |
| 122. Go bowling with friends | 141. Work with things rather than people |
| 123. Giving first aid assistance | 142. Lead a round-table discussion |
| 124. Read a book on bridge | 143. Prepare payrolls for a large company |
| 125. Read a book about chess | 144. Be responsible for establishing policies and procedures in an organization |
| 126. Be a loan manager of a bank | 145. Plan experiment using human beings as subjects |
| 127. Evaluate a research article for adequacy of design of the research | 146. Work as a research scientist in a university laboratory |
| 128. Run for political office | 147. Read a book on "Theories of Personality" |
| 129. Take an active part in the Mental Health Movement | 148. Design a new home |
| 130. Coordinate and direct the work of several branch offices | 149. Supervise a group of professional people |
| 131. Help agencies locate living places for evicted families | 150. Conduct a discussion group for teenagers on their problems |
| 132. Decorate a room with flowers | 151. Visit art galleries |
| 133. Design a store front | |
| 134 Play the game "Monopoly" | |

152. Plan the procedures for a scientific experiment
153. Look at shop windows
154. Interview men for a job
155. Conduct an experiment on atom smashing
156. Read about utopian movements and ideas
157. Work with a group that is trying to help the unemployed
158. Read a novel about a wall street stock manipulator
159. Raise flowers
160. Experiment on the effects of beta rays upon heredity
161. Be a political speech writer
162. Tour a neighborhood of fine homes to enjoy the architectural designs
163. Determine the cost of building or furnishing a house
164. Aid in the placement of old men in a home for the aged
165. Help married couples who are planning separation to solve their problems
166. Do research on the relation of electrical brain waves to thinking
167. Organize a play
168. Be a business manager for a hospital
169. Read an article by a political columnist
170. Act as a consultant on Canadian trade
171. Compare the treatments of a classical work as given by two fine musicians
172. Make a comparative study of architectural styles
173. Forecast economic trends for a brokerage firm
174. Write a technical book
175. Prepare the advertising for a new product
176. Engage in discussions of economic affairs
177. Visit families for the purpose of giving them community assistance
178. Encourage new industry in your area
179. Buy, remodel and sell houses
180. Raise money for charity
181. Write a new arrangement for a musical theme
182. Determine the cost of operation of a machine
183. Design the landscaping for a hillside home
184. Study the style of a certain artist
185. Meet and direct people
186. Paint a landscape scene

- | | |
|---|---|
| 187. Compare the color treatment in the work of two artists | 203. Judge paintings to determine the winner in a contest |
| 188. Do things that require precision | 204. Preside at a meeting to organize a new group |
| 189. Buy and sell stocks and bonds for other people | 205. Inspect and criticize artistic works |
| 190. Act as chairman of a committee on arrangements for a convention | 206. Invest in a subdivision with a chance that its value will increase rapidly |
| 191. Look at a collection of rare laces | 207. Participate in discussions of politics |
| 192. Take an active part in student council | 208. Listen to a political speech |
| 193. Develop an improved classification of nervous and mental disease | 209. Read biographies of great statesmen |
| 194. Work as a research scientist in an industrial laboratory | 210. Read "Scientific American" magazine |
| 195. Develop a business system | 211. Help decide which of a series of sculptured figures is the most beautiful |
| 196. Attend a ballet performance | 212. Help plan a political campaign |
| 197. Lobby for or against pending issues | 213. Be pitted against another in a political race |
| 198. Interview prospects in selling | 214. Look at a collection of antique furniture |
| 199. Think out the logical deductions from a scientific discovery | 215. Work out a new system for predicting the weather |
| 200. Teach children | 216. Display merchandise in a store |
| 201. Work as a probation officer with paroled individuals | 217. Do research on the effects of a vitamin upon the growth of mice |
| 202. Examine designs of homes, comparing them for artistic appeal | |

- | | |
|---|---|
| 218. Visit an art museum | 235. Study the various methods used in scientific investigations |
| 219. Interview individuals who are applicants for welfare assistance | 236. Be a political reporter |
| 220. Develop a new subdivision of real estate | 237. Try to cure mentally disturbed |
| 221. Paint a portrait of an interesting face | 238. Study and write about the theoretical aspects of science |
| 222. Play a part in a dramatic production | 239. Prepare the fiscal budget for a large company |
| 223. Be instrumental in the formation of an emergency military government in a time of disaster | 240. Give advice on the development of a government for a newly independent country |
| 224. Participate in a political debate | 241. Be president of your favorite club |
| 225. Work with people rather than ideas | 242. Judge the entries in a photo contest |
| 226. Do medical research | 243. Work with delinquent boys and girls to help them adjust |
| 227. Select a painting to hang on the wall of a home | 244. Plan the public image for a politician |
| 228. Be a member of the National Research Council | 245. Determine wave-lengths of spectral lines in a spectroscope |
| 229. Read "The Rise of Scientific Philosophy", by Hans Reichenbach | 246. Study the history of music |
| 230. Create a new artistic effect i.e., improve beauty of an automobile etc. | 247. Calculate expansion costs for a manufacturing firm |
| 231. Determine the earth's magnetic forces at different locations | 248. Be an income tax consultant |
| 232. Prepare illustrations for a magazine | 249. Evaluate a group of greeting cards as to beauty |
| 233. Act as a guide or adviser to a magazine | |
| 234. Learn about new theories in science | |

250. Play a musical instrument
251. Prepare and submit your bid for a quantity of goods
252. Promote the development of a new oilfield
253. Interview people who have mental or emotional problems
254. Advise people on investment
255. Act as representative of a large number of shareholders in a large corporation
256. Work out the details of a scientific theory
257. Try to influence friends to vote for your favorite candidate
258. Read articles on social reform
259. Help the government redesign its tax structure
260. Adjust difficulties of others
261. Work with orphans and neglected children
262. Preside at a business meeting
263. Sketch action scenes on a drawing pad
264. Look after the finances of an organization
265. Lead a movement to "clean up" corrupt government
266. Watch a film about the operations of the Toronto Stock Exchange
267. Teaching adults
268. Help bring about changes in present police policy with respect to punishment of drug addicts
269. Help give unwed mothers a fresh start
270. Judge window displays in a contest
271. Read poetry
272. Perform the duties of a political campaign manager
273. Work with alcoholics to help them adjust
274. Read about the basic principles of scientific methods
275. Lead a committee to bring about needed changes in your community
276. Be an economic consultant to a large manufacturing concern
277. Visit a showing of a collection of rare objects of art
278. Read about theories of atomic energy
279. Plan a new job for people displaced by automation
280. Find ways to decrease packaging costs for a food manufacturer

- | | |
|--|---|
| 281. Read about the history of the Stock Market | 292. Interview veterans to help with their personal problems |
| 282. Be alone | |
| 283. Contribute to charities | 293. Speak on behalf of a political candidate |
| 284. Design clothing | 294. Institute a campaign for the promotion of a worthy cause |
| 285. Buy a run-down business and make it grow | |
| 286. Work out a profit sharing plan for the management of a company | 295. Calculate degrees of risk for an insurance company |
| 287. Represent a number of other people in presenting grievances to a superior | 296. Make observations using a microscope |
| 288. Develop a new system for predicting astronomical events | 297. Watch a movie about social problems |
| 289. Run a community recreation center for teenagers | 298. Think about the underlying assumptions of science |
| 290. Speculate in the stock market | 299. Attend musical concerts |
| 291. Direct an orchestra or band | 300. Investigate potential parents in an adoption agency |

APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTION OF TEST BOOKLET

TEST BOOKLET

This is a test of your ability to predict other people's behavior. It involves items from an interest test. Your task will be to predict how certain persons would answer some of these interest-test items. Your score on this test will be the number of correct predictions that you make.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

In order that your test may be scored accurately, it is important for you to carefully consider the following directions.

A) This booklet contains four (4) separate parts. Each of these parts consists of an Information section, a TEST ITEM section, and places for your prediction.

The INFORMATION section will present you with information about a real person. This information will be in the form of answers this person has given to certain interest-test items. It is important that you give your attention to these items and the person's responses to them because it is on the basis of this information that you will be asked to predict how this same person answered other items.

The TEST ITEM section in each part is made up of 24 items. Each of these items designates an OCCUPATION, AMUSEMENT, ACTIVITY, OR SCHOOL SUBJECT which an individual may either like or dislike.

EXAMPLES:

OCCUPATIONS: "Lawyer," "milliner", "radio program director".

AMUSEMENTS: "Bridge", "solving mechanical puzzles", "museums".

ACTIVITIES: "Being first to wear the very latest fashions", "writing reports", "contributing to charities".

SCHOOL SUBJECTS: "Algebra", "mechanical drawing", "public speaking".

In each part you will be asked to predict whether the person designated in the INFORMATION section of that part would like or dislike the OCCUPATION, AMUSEMENT, ACTIVITY, or SCHOOL SUBJECT given in the 24 items of the test section.

The places for your predictions provided in each part consist of pairs of letters L (for Like) and D (for Dislike). These pairs are numbered from 1 to 24. You are to decide whether the Person designated in that part would like or dislike each item. Your predictions are to be indicated by circling the letter which corresponds to your prediction for each item.

B) EXAMPLE:

INFORMATION

The person for whom you are asked to make predictions in this part (whom we will call Person "A") has answered the lettered items below in the way indicated. Consider this information carefully because it is the only information you will have about Person "A" upon which to base your predictions.

ITEM	PERSON "A"'s ANSWER	ITEM	PERSON "A"'s ANSWER
A) Algebra	<input checked="" type="radio"/> L D	C) Buy goods for a dept. store	<input checked="" type="radio"/> L D
B) Do an exper- iment with the muscle and nerve of a frog.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> L D	D) Fun for pol- itical office.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> L D

Fill out the answer section as you think Person "A" would for the 24 items on the opposite page. That is, try to predict on the basis of the information given above, whether Person "A" would like or dislike each of the activities indicated.

(on facing page)

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| 1) Actor (Actress)..... | L | D |
| 2) Bridge..... | L | D |
| 3) Writing reports..... | L | D |
| 4) Plan the interior decoration of a home..... | L | D |
| 5) Zoology..... | L | D |

Do you think that Person "A" would say that he (she) would like or dislike the job of Actor (Actress)? If you think she (he) would say LIKE then you would circle the L for item #1. If you think that she (he) would say DISLIKE then, of course, you would circle the D. Be sure that the number of the answer corresponds to the number of the item on the TEST you are answering.

C) You will be predicting for a different person in each part. There are 4 parts so you will be making predictions for 4 different persons. Remember, these are real, not hypothetical people. They are not people in your present course. It is unlikely that you know any of them personally, although it is not impossible. The only thing you will know about them, is the information given in each part.

D) Complete the sections in the order in which they are placed in your booklet. Do not turn from one part to the next until you have completed all of the items on the part on which you are working. Do not turn back to a section once you have finished it and gone onto the next.

E) It is important that you answer ALL the items. Even if you feel that you have to guess, answer each item.

INFORMATION

The person for whom you are asked to make predictions in this part (whom we will call Person "AA") has answered the lettered items below in the way indicated. Consider this information carefully because it is the only information you will have about Person "AA" upon which to base your predictions.

ITEM

- a) Plan the interior decoration of a home....(L) D
- b) Examine designs of homes, comparing them
for artistic appeal.....(L) D
- c) Look at a collection of antique furniture..(L) D
- d) Evaluate a group of greeting cards as to
beauty.....(L) D
- e) Design clothing.....(L) D

The page facing, is the answer section. Fill out the answer section as you think Person "AA" would for the twenty-four items. That is, try to predict on the basis of the information given above, whether Person "AA" would like or dislike each of the activities indicated.

PERSON PREDICTED:

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 1) | Art.....L | D |
| 2) | Dramatics.....L | D |
| 3) | Design furniture.....L | D |
| 4) | Mould a statue in clay.....L | D |
| 5) | Evaluate the emotional appeal of a particular opera.....L | D |
| 6) | Decorate a room with flowers.....L | D |
| 7) | Design a store front.....L | D |
| 8) | Attend a style show.....L | D |
| 9) | Organize a playL | D |
| 10) | Compare the treatments of a classical work as given by two fine musicians.....L | D |
| 11) | Buy, remodel and sell houses.....L | D |
| 12) | Study the style of a certain artist.....L | D |
| 13) | Paint a landscape scene.....L | D |
| 14) | Compare the color treatment in the works of two artists.....L | D |
| 15) | Look at a collection of rare lace.....L | D |
| 16) | Attend a ballet performance.....L | D |
| 17) | Judge paintings to determine the winner of a contest.....L | D |
| 18) | Inspect and criticize two artistic works...L | D |
| 19) | Display merchandise in a store.....L | D |
| 20) | Paint a portrait of an interesting face....L | D |
| 21) | Prepare illustrations for a magazine.....L | D |
| 22) | Judge the entries in a photo contest.....L | D |
| 23) | Sketch action scenes on a drawing pad.....L | D |
| 24) | Direct an orchestra or a band.....L | D |

INFORMATION

The Person for whom you are asked to make predictions in this part (whom we will call Person "CC") has answered the lettered items below in the way indicated. Consider this information carefully because it is the only information you will have about Person "CC" upon which to base your predictions.

ITEM

- | | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| a) Author of a novel | (L) | D |
| b) President of Local Retailers Associations | L | (D) |
| c) High school teacher | L | (D) |
| d) Manufacturer | L | (D) |
| e) Plan the interior decorations of a home | L | (D) |
| f) Purchasing agent | L | (D) |
| g) Examine designs of homes, comparing them for
artistic appeal | L | (D) |
| h) Retailer | L | (D) |
| i) Look at collection of antique furniture | L | (D) |
| j) Civics | L | (D) |
| k) Evaluate a group of greeting cards as to beauty | L | (D) |
| l) Economics | L | (D) |
| m) Design clothing | L | (D) |
| n) Modern business methods | L | (D) |
| o) Prepare advertising for new houses to be offered
for sale | (L) | D |

The page facing is the answer section. Fill out the answer section as you think Person "CC" would for the twenty four items. That is, try to predict, on the basis of the information given above, whether Person "CC" would like or dislike each of the activities indicated.

PERSON PREDICTED:

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 1) | Art.....L | D |
| 2) | Dramatics.....L | D |
| 3) | Design furniture.....L | D |
| 4) | Mould a statue in clay.....L | D |
| 5) | Evaluate the emotional appeal of a particular opera.....L | D |
| 6) | Decorate a room with flowers.....L | D |
| 7) | Design a store front.....L | D |
| 8) | Attend a style show.....L | D |
| 9) | Organize a playL | D |
| 10) | Compare the treatments of a classical work as given by two fine musicians.....L | D |
| 11) | Buy, remodel and sell houses.....L | D |
| 12) | Study the style of a certain artist.....L | D |
| 13) | Paint a landscape scene.....L | D |
| 14) | Compare the color treatment in the works of two artists.....L | D |
| 15) | Look at a collection of rare lace.....L | D |
| 16) | Attend a ballet performance.....L | D |
| 17) | Judge paintings to determine the winner of a contest.....L | D |
| 18) | Inspect and criticize two artistic works...L | D |
| 19) | Display merchandise in a store.....L | D |
| 20) | Paint a portrait of an interesting face....L | D |
| 21) | Prepare illustrations for a magazine.....L | D |
| 22) | Judge the entries in a photo contest.....L | D |
| 23) | Sketch action scenes on a drawing pad.....L | D |
| 24) | Direct an orchestra or a band.....L | D |

PERSON PREDICTED:

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 1) | Art.....L | D |
| 2) | Dramatics.....L | D |
| 3) | Design furniture.....L | D |
| 4) | Mould a statue in clay.....L | D |
| 5) | Evaluate the emotional appeal of a particular opera.....L | D |
| 6) | Decorate a room with flowers.....L | D |
| 7) | Design a store front.....L | D |
| 8) | Attend a style show.....L | D |
| 9) | Organize a playL | D |
| 10) | Compare the treatments of a classical work as given by two fine musicians.....L | D |
| 11) | Buy, remodel and sell houses.....L | D |
| 12) | Study the style of a certain artist.....L | D |
| 13) | Paint a landscape scene.....L | D |
| 14) | Compare the color treatment in the works of two artists.....L | D |
| 15) | Look at a collection of rare lace.....L | D |
| 16) | Attend a ballet performance.....L | D |
| 17) | Judge paintings to determine the winner of a contest.....L | D |
| 18) | Inspect and criticize two artistic works...L | D |
| 19) | Display merchandise in a store.....L | D |
| 20) | Paint a portrait of an interesting face....L | D |
| 21) | Prepare illustrations for a magazine.....L | D |
| 22) | Judge the entries in a photo contest.....L | D |
| 23) | Sketch action scenes on a drawing pad.....L | D |
| 24) | Direct an orchestra or a band.....L | D |

INFORMATION

The Person for whom you are asked to make predictions in this part (whom we will call Person "BD") has answered the lettered items below in the way indicated. Consider this information carefully because it is the only information you will have about Person "BD" upon which to base your predictions.

ITEM

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| a) Poet | L | (D) |
| b) Art | L | (D) |
| c) Become an expert at appraising the value of homes, furnishings, or cars | (L) | D |
| d) Design a new home | L | (D) |
| e) Do research on the relation of electrical brain waves to thinking | (L) | D |
| f) Prepare illustrations for a magazine | L | (D) |
| g) Play a musical instrument | L | (D) |
| h) Be alone | L | (D) |
| i) Musician | (L) | D |
| j) Scientific research worker | L | (D) |
| k) Attend a symphony concert | L | (D) |
| l) Read "National Geographic" magazine | (L) | D |
| m) Tour a neighbourhood of fine homes to enjoy the architectural designs | L | (D) |
| n) Design the landscaping for a hillside home | L | (D) |
| o) Read "Scientific American" magazine | (L) | D |
| p) Act as representative of a large number of shareholders in a large corporation | (D) | D |
| q) Artist | L | (D) |
| r) Algebra | (L) | D |
| s) Mathematics | (L) | D |
| t) Plan the procedures for a scientific experiment | (L) | D |
| u) Visit an art gallery | L | (D) |
| v) Visit an art museum | L | (D) |
| w) Study the history of music | L | (D) |
| x) Sketch action scenes on a drawing pad | L | (D) |
| y) Study the various methods used in scientific investigation | (L) | D |

The page facing is the answer section. Fill out the answer section as you think Person "BD" would for the twenty four items. That is, try to predict on the basis of the information given above, whether Person "BD" would like or dislike each of the activities indicated.

INFORMATION

The person for whom you are asked to make predictions in this part (whom we will call Person "BB") has answered the lettered items below in the way indicated. Consider this information carefully because it is the only information you will have about Person "BB" upon which to base your predictions.

ITEM

- | | | | |
|----|--|-----|-----|
| a) | Scientific research worker..... | (L) | D |
| b) | Work with a group that is trying to help the unemployed..... | L | (D) |
| c) | Plan the procedures for a scientific experiment..... | (L) | D |
| d) | Interview people who have mental or emotional problems..... | L | (D) |
| e) | Do research on the relation of electrical brain waves to thinking..... | (L) | D |
| f) | Adjust difficulties of others..... | L | (D) |
| g) | Read "Scientific American" magazine..... | (L) | D |
| h) | Work with orphans and neglected children..... | L | (D) |
| i) | Study the various methods used in scientific investigation..... | (L) | D |
| j) | Investigate potential parents in an adoption agency..... | L | (D) |

The facing page is the answer section. Fill out the answer questions as you think person "BB" would for the twenty-four items. That is, try to predict, on the basis of the information given, whether Person "BB" would like or dislike each of the activities indicated.

PERSON PREDICTED:

- 1) Chemist.....L D
- 2) InventorL D
- 3) Playground directorL D
- 4) PhysicsL D
- 5) Read about the development of scientific
ideasL D
- 6) Help agencies locate living places for the
evicted familiesL D
- 7) Conduct an experiment on atom smashingL D
- 8) Interview men for a jobL D
- 9) Experiment on the effects of beta rays upon
heredityL D
- 10) Aid in the placement of old men in a home for
the agedL D
- 11) Visit families for the purpose of giving them
community assistanceL D
- 12) Raise money for charityL D
- 13) Develop an improved classification of
nervous and mental diseaseL D
- 14) Think about the logical deductions from a
scientific discoveryL D
- 15) Work as a probation officer with paroled
individualsL D
- 16) Interview individuals who are applicants for
welfare assistanceL D
- 17) Learn about new theories of scienceL D
- 18) Try to cure mentally disturbedL D
- 19) Work out details of scientific experiments ..L D
- 20) Work with alcoholics to help them adjustL D
- 21) Read about the basic principles of the
scientific methodL D
- 22) Plan new jobs for people displaced by
automationL D
- 23) Interview veterans to help with their
personal problemsL D
- 24) Think about the underlying assumptions of
scienceL D

INFORMATION

The person for whom you are asked to make predictions in this Part (whom we will call person "CJ") has answered the lettered items below in the way indicated. Consider this information carefully because it is the only information you will have about Person "CJ" upon which to base your predictions.

ITEM

- a) Plan the interior decorations of a home L ☒ D
- b) Author of a novel ☒ L D
- c) Examine designs of homes, comparing them for artistic appeal L ☒ D
- d) President of a Local Retailers Association L ☒ D
- e) Plan the procedures for a scientific experiment ... ☒ L D
- f) Manufacturer L ☒ D
- g) Look at a collection of antique furniture L ☒ D
- h) High School teacher L ☒ D
- i) Read "The Rise of Scientific Philosophy" by Hans Reichenbach ☒ L D
- j) Purchasing agent L ☒ D
- k) Study the various methods used in scientific investigation ☒ L D
- l) Retailer L ☒ D
- m) Evaluate a group of greeting cards as to beauty L ☒ D
- n) Civics L ☒ D
- o) Read "Scientific American" magazine ☒ L D
- p) Economics L ☒ D
- q) Understand theoretical ideas like Einstein's theories ☒ L D
- r) Modern business methods L ☒ D
- s) Design clothing L ☒ D
- t) Prepare advertising for new houses to be offered for sale ☒ L D

The page facing is the answer section. Fill out the answer section as you think Person "CJ" would for the 24 items. That is, try to predict, on the basis of the information given above, whether "CJ" likes or dislikes each activity.

PERSON PREDICTED:

- 1) Chemist.....L D
- 2) InventorL D
- 3) Playground directorL D
- 4) PhysicsL D
- 5) Read about the development of scientific
ideasL D
- 6) Help agencies locate living places for the
evicted familiesL D
- 7) Conduct an experiment on atom smashingL D
- 8) Interview men for a jobL D
- 9) Experiment on the effects of beta rays upon
heredityL D
- 10) Aid in the placement of old men in a home for
the agedL D
- 11) Visit families for the purpose of giving them
community assistanceL D
- 12) Raise money for charityL D
- 13) Develop an improved classification of
nervous and mental diseaseL D
- 14) Think about the logical deductions from a
scientific discoveryL D
- 15) Work as a probation officer with paroled
individualsL D
- 16) Interview individuals who are applicants for
welfare assistanceL D
- 17) Learn about new theories of scienceL D
- 18) Try to cure mentally disturbedL D
- 19) Work out details of scientific experiments ..L D
- 20) Work with alcoholics to help them adjustL D
- 21) Read about the basic principles of the
scientific methodL D
- 22) Plan new jobs for people displaced by
automationL D
- 23) Interview veterans to help with their
personal problemsL D
- 24) Think about the underlying assumptions of
scienceL D

The Person for whom you are asked to make predictions in this part (whom we will call Person "AE") has answered the lettered items below in the way indicated. Consider this information carefully because it is the only information you will have about Person "AE" upon which to base your predictions.

ITEM

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| a) Plan the interior decorations of a home | (L) | D |
| b) Author of a novel | L | (D) |
| c) Examine designs of homes, comparing them for artistic appeal | (L) | D |
| d) Become an expert at appraising the value of homes, furnishings, or cars | L | (D) |
| e) President of a Local Retailer's Association | (L) | D |
| f) Plan the procedures for a scientific experiment | L | (D) |
| g) Manufacturer | L | (D) |
| h) Go from door to door persuading people to vote in a certain way | L | (D) |
| i) Plan a marketing campaign for a new line of synthetic garments | L | (D) |
| j) Look at a collection of antique furniture | (L) | D |
| k) High School Teacher | (L) | D |
| l) Read "National Geographic" magazine | L | (L) |
| m) Read "The Rise of Scientific Philosophy" by Hans Reichenbach | L | (D) |
| n) Purchasing agent | L | (D) |
| o) Buy goods for a department store | (L) | D |
| p) Study the various methods used in scientific investigation | L | (D) |
| q) Retailer | L | (D) |
| r) Prepare payrolls for a large company | L | (D) |
| s) Evaluate a group of greeting cards as to beauty | (L) | D |
| t) Civics | L | (D) |
| u) Evaluate expansion costs for a manufacturing firm | L | (D) |
| v) Read "Scientific American" magazine | L | (D) |
| w) Economics | L | (D) |
| x) Act as a representative of a large number of shareholders in a large corporation | L | (D) |
| y) Understand theoretical ideas like Einstein's theories. | L | (D) |
| z) Modern business methods | (L) | D |
| A) Design clothing | L | (D) |
| B) Buy a run down business and make it grow | (L) | D |
| C) Prepare advertising for new houses to be offered for sale | (L) | D |
| D) Perform the duties of a political campaign manager ... | L | (L) |

The page facing is the answer section. Fill out the answer section as you think Person "AE" would for the twenty four items. That is, try to predict, on the basis of the information given above, whether Person "AE" would like or dislike each of the activities indicated.

PERSON PREDICTED:

- 1) Chemist.....L D
- 2) InventorL D
- 3) Playground directorL D
- 4) PhysicsL D
- 5) Read about the development of scientific
ideasL D
- 6) Help agencies locate living places for the
evicted familiesL D
- 7) Conduct an experiment on atom smashingL D
- 8) Interview men for a jobL D
- 9) Experiment on the effects of beta rays upon
heredityL D
- 10) Aid in the placement of old men in a home for
the agedL D
- 11) Visit families for the purpose of giving them
community assistanceL D
- 12) Raise money for charityL D
- 13) Develop an improved classification of
nervous and mental diseaseL D
- 14) Think about the logical deductions from a
scientific discoveryL D
- 15) Work as a probation officer with paroled
individualsL D
- 16) Interview individuals who are applicants for
welfare assistanceL D
- 17) Learn about new theories of scienceL D
- 18) Try to cure mentally disturbedL D
- 19) Work out details of scientific experiments ..L D
- 20) Work with alcoholics to help them adjustL D
- 21) Read about the basic principles of the
scientific methodL D
- 22) Plan new jobs for people displaced by
automationL D
- 23) Interview veterans to help with their
personal problemsL D
- 24) Think about the underlying assumptions of
scienceL D

INFORMATION

The Person for whom you are asked to make predictions in this part (whom we will call Person "BF") has answered the lettered items below in the way indicated. Consider this information carefully because it is the only information you will have about Person "BF" upon which to base your predictions.

ITEM

- a) Scientific research worker (L) D
- b) Run for political office (L) D
- c) Work with a group that is trying to help the
unemployed L (D)
- d) Plan the procedures for a scientific experiment (L) D
- e) Lobby for or against pending issues (L) D
- f) Interview people who have mental or emotional problems. L (D)
- g) Do research on the relation of electrical brain waves
to thinking (L) D
- h) Help plan a political campaign (L) D
- i) Adjust difficulties of others L (D)
- j) Read "Scientific American" magazine (L) D
- k) Participate in a political debate (L) D
- l) Work with orphans and neglected children L (D)
- m) Study the various methods used in scientific
investigation (L) D
- n) Try to influence friends to vote for your favorite
candidate (L) D
- o) Investigate potential parents in an adoption agency ... L (D)

The facing page is the answer section. Fill out the answer section as you think Person "BF" would for the twenty four items. That is, try to predict on the basis of the information given above, whether Person "BF" would like or dislike each of the activities indicated.

PERSON PREDICTED:

- | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|
| 1) | Inventor | L | D |
| 2) | Playground director | L | D |
| 3) | Physics | L | D |
| 4) | Design furniture | L | D |
| 5) | Read about the development of scientific ideas | L | D |
| 6) | Decorate a room with flowers | L | D |
| 7) | Design a store front | L | D |
| 8) | Work as a research scientist in a university
laboratory | L | D |
| 9) | Interview men for a job | L | D |
| 10) | Paint a landscape scene | L | D |
| 11) | Aid in the placement of old men in a home for the
aged | L | D |
| 12) | Organize a play | L | D |
| 13) | Visit families for the purpose of giving them
community assistance | L | D |
| 14) | Study the style of a certain artist | L | D |
| 15) | Compare the color treatments in the works of two
artists | L | D |
| 16) | Think out the logical deductions from a scientific
discovery | L | D |
| 17) | Judge paintings to determine the winner of a contest | L | D |
| 18) | Interview individuals who are applicants for welfare
assistance | L | D |
| 19) | Be a member of the National Research Council | L | D |
| 20) | Prepare illustrations for a magazine | L | D |
| 21) | Work with alcoholics to help them adjust | L | D |
| 22) | Read about the basic principles of the scientific
method | L | D |
| 23) | Plan new jobs for people displaced by automation.... | L | D |
| 24) | Think about the underlying assumptions of science... | L | D |

INFORMATION

The Person for whom you are asked to make predictions in this part (whom we will call Person "B" has answered the lettered items below in the way indicated. Consider this information carefully because it is the only information you will have about Person "B" upon which to base your predictions.

ITEM

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| a) Algebra | L | D |
| b) Help plan a political campaign | (L) | D |
| c) Attend a symphony concert | L | D |
| d) Work with orphans and neglected children | L | (D) |
| e) Study the various methods used in scientific investigation | (L) | D |
| f) Investigate potential parents in an adoption agency | L | (B) |
| g) Artist | L | (B) |
| h) Musician | L | (D) |
| i) Interview people having mental or emotional problems | L | (D) |
| j) Do research on the relation of electrical brain waves to thinking | (L) | D |
| k) Mathematics | (L) | D |
| l) Participate in a political debate | (L) | D |
| m) Read "National Geographic" magazine | (L) | D |
| n) Try to influence friends to vote for your favorite candidate | (L) | D |
| o) Scientific research worker | (L) | D |
| p) Lobby for or against pending issues | (L) | D |
| q) Art | L | (D) |
| r) adjust difficulties of others | L | (D) |
| s) Read "Scientific American: magazine | (L) | D |
| t) Become an expert at appraising the value of homes, furnishings or cars | L | (D) |
| u) Design a new home | L | (D) |
| v) Run for political office | (L) | D |
| w) Plan the procedures for a scientific experiment | (L) | D |
| x) Work with a group that is trying to help the unemployed | L | (D) |
| y) Poet | L | (D) |

The page facing is the answer section. Fill out the answer section as you think Person "B" would for the twenty four items. That is, try to predict, on the basis of the information given above, whether Person "B" would like or dislike each of the activities indicated.

PERSON PREDICTED:

- 1) InventorL D
- 2) Playground directorL D
- 3) PhysicsL D
- 4) Design furnitureL D
- 5) Read about the development of scientific ideasL D
- 6) Decorate a room with flowersL D
- 7) Design a store frontL D
- 8) Work as a research scientist in a university
laboratoryL D
- 9) Interview men for a jobL D
- 10) Paint a landscape sceneL D
- 11) Aid in the placement of old men in a home for the
agedL D
- 12) Organize a playL D
- 13) Visit families for the purpose of giving them
community assistanceL D
- 14) Study the style of a certain artistL D
- 15) Compare the color treatments in the works of two
artistsL D
- 16) Think out the logical deductions from a scientific
discoveryL D
- 17) Judge paintings to determine the winner of a contestL D
- 18) Interview individuals who are applicants for welfare
assistanceL D
- 19) Be a member of the National Research CouncilL D
- 20) Prepare illustrations for a magazineL D
- 21) Work with alcoholics to help them adjustL D
- 22) Read about the basic principles of the scientific
methodL D
- 23) Plan new jobs for people displaced by automation....L D
- 24) Think about the underlying assumptions of science...L D

INFORMATION

The Person for whom you are asked to make predictions in this part (whom we will call Person "AH") has answered the lettered items below in the way indicated. Consider this information carefully because it is the only information you will have about Person "AH" upon which to base your predictions.

ITEM

- | | | |
|--|----------|----------|
| a) Author of a novel | L | <u>D</u> |
| b) Plan the interior decoration of a home | <u>L</u> | D |
| c) President of a Local Retailers Association | <u>L</u> | D |
| d) Work with a group that is trying to help unemployed. | <u>L</u> | D |
| e) High School teacher..... | <u>L</u> | D |
| f) Scientific research worker | L | <u>D</u> |
| g) Manufacturer | L | <u>D</u> |
| h) Examine designs of homes, comparing them for
artistic appeal | <u>L</u> | D |
| i) Purchasing Agent | L | <u>D</u> |
| j) Interview people having mental or emotional problems | <u>L</u> | D |
| k) Retailer | L | <u>D</u> |
| l) Plan the procedures for a scientific experiment | L | <u>D</u> |
| m) Civics | L | <u>D</u> |
| n) Look at a collection of antique furniture | <u>L</u> | D |
| o) Economics | L | <u>D</u> |
| p) Adjust difficulties of others | <u>L</u> | D |
| q) Modern business methods | <u>L</u> | D |
| r) Do research on the relation of electrical brain
waves to thinking..... | L | <u>D</u> |
| s) Prepare advertising for new houses offered for sale. | <u>L</u> | D |
| t) Evaluate greeting cards as to beauty | <u>L</u> | D |
| u) Become an expert at appraising the value of homes,
furnishings or cars | L | <u>D</u> |
| v) Work with orphans and neglected children | <u>L</u> | D |
| w) Go from door to door persuading people to vote a
certain way | L | <u>D</u> |
| x) Read "Scientific American" magazine | L | <u>D</u> |
| y) Read "National Geographic" magazine | <u>L</u> | D |
| z) Design clothing | <u>L</u> | D |
| A) Buy goods for department store..... | <u>L</u> | D |
| B) Investigate potential parents in an adoption agency. | <u>L</u> | D |
| C) Prepare payrolls for a large company | L | <u>D</u> |
| D) Study various methods in scientific investigations . | L | <u>D</u> |
| E) Calculate expansion costs for a manufacturing firm . | L | <u>D</u> |
| F) Act as representative of a large number of share-
holders in a large corporation | L | <u>D</u> |
| G) Perform the duties of a political campaign manager . | L | <u>D</u> |
| H) Buy a rundown business and make it grow | <u>L</u> | D |
| I) Plan a marketing campaign for a new line of
synthetic garments | <u>L</u> | D |

The page facing is the answer section. Fill out answer section as you think Person "AH" would for the 24 items. That is, try to predict, on the basis of information above whether person "AH" would like or dislike each of the activities indicated.

PERSON PREDICTED:

- 1) InventorL D
- 2) Playground directorL D
- 3) PhysicsL D
- 4) Design furnitureL D
- 5) Read about the development of scientific ideasL D
- 6) Decorate a room with flowersL D
- 7) Design a store frontL D
- 8) Work as a research scientist in a university
laboratoryL D
- 9) Interview men for a jobL D
- 10) Paint a landscape sceneL D
- 11) Aid in the placement of old men in a home for the
agedL D
- 12) Organize a playL D
- 13) Visit families for the purpose of giving them
community assistanceL D
- 14) Study the style of a certain artistL D
- 15) Compare the color treatments in the works of two
artistsL D
- 16) Think out the logical deductions from a scientific
discoveryL D
- 17) Judge paintings to determine the winner of a contestL D
- 18) Interview individuals who are applicants for welfare
assistanceL D
- 19) Be a member of the National Research CouncilL D
- 20) Prepare illustrations for a magazineL D
- 21) Work with alcoholics to help them adjustL D
- 22) Read about the basic principles of the scientific
methodL D
- 23) Plan new jobs for people displaced by automation....L D
- 24) Think about the underlying assumptions of science...L D

B29893